



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI, LLP
666 FIFTH AVE
NEW YORK NY 10103-3198

MAILED

MAR 07 2011

In re Application of : **OFFICE OF PETITIONS**
Boon et al. :
Application No. 08/819,669 :
Filed: March 17, 1997 : **DECISION**
Attorney Docket No. LUD-5253.5.D :
For: Isolated Tumor Rejection Antigen :
Precursor Proteins Mage-2 and Mage-3 :
:

The above-identified application has been forwarded to the undersigned for consideration of a petition for patent term extension entitled "Petition for Review of Patent Term Extension (37 CFR 1.181, MPEP 2720)" received on August 25, 2010.

The petition is **dismissed**.

Background

Petitioner asserts that the patent to be issued from the above identified application is entitled to a patent term extension of 5 years. Petitioner asserts that the Notice of Allowance and Issue Fee(s) Due Notice, which included a determination that the patent term extension was 407 days, is in error, as the application is entitled to an additional 1443 days of patent term extension. Petitioner asserts that the application is entitled to 407 days based on the first suspension, 259 days based on the second suspension, 791 days based on the first appeal and 383 days based on the second appeal for a total of 1850 days of patent term extension, which is greater than 5 years.

On March 17, 1997, the above identified application was received by the Office.

On August 20, 2001, a first Letter of Suspension was mailed by the Office.

On June 17, 2003, a second Letter of Suspension was mailed by the Office.

On March 31, 2004, a Notice of Appeal was received by the Office.

On June 7, 2006, a Decision by the BPAI reversing the decision of the Examiner was mailed by the Office.

On August 6, 2007, a Notice of Appeal was received by the Office.

On January 16, 2009, a Decision by the BPAI reversing the decision of the Examiner was mailed by the Office.

On August 23, 2010, a Notice of Allowance and Issue Fee(s) Due notice, which included a determination that the patent term extension was 407 days, was mailed by the Office.

Applicable Statutes and Regulation

35 U.S.C. 135 Interferences.

(a) Whenever an application is made for a patent which, in the opinion of the Director, would interfere with any pending application, or with any unexpired patent, an interference may be declared and the Director shall give notice of such declaration to the applicants, or applicant and patentee, as the case may be. The Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences shall determine questions of priority of the inventions and may determine questions of patentability. Any final decision, if adverse to the claim of an applicant, shall constitute the final refusal by the Patent and Trademark Office of the claims involved, and the Director may issue a patent to the applicant who is adjudged the prior inventor. A final judgment adverse to a patentee from which no appeal or other review has been or can be taken or had shall constitute cancellation of the claims involved in the patent, and notice of such cancellation shall be endorsed on copies of the patent distributed after such cancellation by the Patent and Trademark Office. . . .

35 U.S.C. 154. Contents and term of patent (in effect on June 8, 1995)

(b) TERM EXTENSION.-

(1) INTERFERENCE DELAY OR SECRECY ORDERS.-If the issue of an original patent is delayed due to a proceeding under section 135(a) of this title, or because the application for patent is placed under an order pursuant to section 181 of this title, the term of the patent shall be extended for the period of delay, but in no case more than 5 years.

(2) EXTENSION FOR APPELLATE REVIEW.-If the issue of a patent is delayed due to appellate review by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences or by a Federal court and the patent is issued pursuant to a decision in the review reversing an adverse determination of patentability, the term of the patent shall be extended for a period of time but in no case more than 5 years. A patent shall not be eligible for extension under this paragraph if it is subject to a terminal disclaimer due to the issue of another patent

claiming subject matter that is not patentably distinct from that under appellate review.

37 CFR 1.701 Extension of patent term due to examination delay under the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (original applications, other than designs, filed on or after June 8, 1995, and before May 29, 2000).

(a) A patent, other than for designs, issued on an application filed on or after June 8, 1995, is entitled to extension of the patent term if the issuance of the patent was delayed due to:

- (1) Interference proceedings under 35 U.S.C. 135(a); and/or
- (2) The application being placed under a secrecy order under 35 U.S.C. 181; and/or

(3) Appellate review by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences or by a Federal court under 35 U.S.C. 141 or 145, if the patent was issued pursuant to a decision in the review reversing an adverse determination of patentability and if the patent is not subject to a terminal disclaimer due to the issuance of another patent claiming subject matter that is not patentably distinct from that under appellate review. If an application is remanded by a panel of the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences and the remand is the last action by a panel of the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences prior to the mailing of a notice of allowance under 35 U.S.C. 151 in the application, the remand shall be considered a decision in the review reversing an adverse determination of patentability as that phrase is used in 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2) as amended by section 532(a) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act, Public Law 103-465, 108 Stat. 4809, 4983-85 (1994), and a final decision in favor of the applicant under paragraph (c)(3) of this section. A remand by a panel of the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences shall not be considered a decision in the review reversing an adverse determination of patentability as provided in this paragraph if there is filed a request for continued examination under 35 U.S.C. 132(b) that was not first preceded by the mailing, after such remand, of at least one of an action under 35 U.S.C. 132 or a notice of allowance under 35 U.S.C. 151.

(b) The term of a patent entitled to extension under paragraph (a) of this section shall be extended for the sum of the periods of delay calculated under paragraphs (c)(1), (c)(2), (c)(3) and (d) of this section, to the extent that these periods are not overlapping, up to a maximum of five years. The extension will run from the expiration date of the patent.

(c)(1) The period of delay under paragraph (a)(1) of this section for an application is the sum of the following periods, to the extent that the periods are not overlapping:

(i) With respect to each interference in which the application was involved, the number of days, if any, in the period beginning on the date the interference was declared or redeclared to involve the application in the interference and ending on the date that the interference was terminated with respect to the application; and

(ii) The number of days, if any, in the period beginning on the date prosecution in the application was suspended by the Patent and Trademark Office due to interference proceedings under 35 U.S.C. 135(a) not involving the application and ending on the date of the termination of the suspension.

(2) The period of delay under paragraph (a)(2) of this section for an application is the sum of the following periods, to the extent that the periods are not overlapping:

(i) The number of days, if any, the application was maintained in a sealed condition under 35 U.S.C. 181;

- (ii) The number of days, if any, in the period beginning on the date of mailing of an examiner's answer under § 41.39 of this title in the application under secrecy order and ending on the date the secrecy order and any renewal thereof was removed;
- (iii) The number of days, if any, in the period beginning on the date applicant was notified that an interference would be declared but for the secrecy order and ending on the date the secrecy order and any renewal thereof was removed; and
- (iv) The number of days, if any, in the period beginning on the date of notification under § 5.3(c) and ending on the date of mailing of the notice of allowance under § 1.311.

(3) The period of delay under paragraph (a)(3) of this section is the sum of the number of days, if any, in the period beginning on the date on which an appeal to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences was filed under 35 U.S.C. 134 and ending on the date of a final decision in favor of the applicant by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences or by a Federal court in an appeal under 35 U.S.C. 141 or a civil action under 35 U.S.C. 145.

(d) The period of delay set forth in paragraph (c)(3) shall be reduced by:

- (1) Any time during the period of appellate review that occurred before three years from the filing of the first national application for patent presented for examination; and
- (2) Any time during the period of appellate review, as determined by the Director, during which the applicant for patent did not act with due diligence. In determining the due diligence of an applicant, the Director may examine the facts and circumstances of the applicant's actions during the period of appellate review to determine whether the applicant exhibited that degree of timeliness as may reasonably be expected from, and which is ordinarily exercised by, a person during a period of appellate review.

(e) The provisions of this section apply only to original patents, except for design patents, issued on applications filed on or after June 8, 1995, and before May 29, 2000.

Opinion

The patent statute only permits extension of patent term based on very specific criteria. The Office has no authority to grant any extension or adjustment of the term due to administrative delays except as authorized by 35 U.S.C. § 154. 35 U.S.C. § 154 provides for patent term extension for appellate review, interference and secrecy order delays in utility and plant applications filed on or after June 8, 1995, and, as amended by the "American Inventors Protection Act of 1999," enacted November 29, 1999, as part of Public Law 106-113, for other specifically defined administrative delays in utility and plant applications filed on or after May 29, 2000.

The above-identified application was filed on March 17, 1997. Accordingly it is entitled to patent term extension based upon the conditions in 35 U.S.C. § 154(b), in effect on June 8, 1995. The provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 154(b) in effect on May 29, 2000 do not apply, because the amended version of 35 U.S.C. § 154(b) only applies to applications filed on or after

May 29, 2000. Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 154(b), in effect on June 8, 1995, an applicant can receive patent term extension only if there was an appellate review, interference or a secrecy order delays as set forth in the statute.

According to 37 CFR 1.701 (c)(1)(ii), an application is entitled to patent term extension for the number of days, in the period beginning on the date prosecution in the application was suspended by the Patent and Trademark Office due to interference proceedings under 35 U.S.C. 135(a) not involving the application and ending on the date of the termination of the suspension.

Petitioner asserts that the application is entitled to patent term extension of 407 days for the first suspension and 259 days for the second suspension. Although prosecution in the application was twice suspended in the above-identified application, the suspensions were due to a potential interference either with or involving one or more other applications. The suspensions were not for the reason that the subject application was involved in an interference, or to await the result of an interference proceeding in another application. As a result, the provisions of 37 CFR 1.701(c)(1)(ii) do not apply because this section applies to suspensions by the "Office due to interference proceedings under 35 U.S.C. 135(a) not involving the application," and in this instance there were no such other interference proceedings. Therefore, Petitioner's argument that he is entitled to an additional 259 days of patent term extension for the period of the second suspensions under 37 CFR 1.701(c)(1)(ii) is not persuasive. The application is entitled to zero (0) days of patent term extension under 37 CFR 1.701(c)(1)(ii).

Petitioner's argument that the application is entitled to additional patent term extension based on successful appeals before the BPAI (791 days based on the first appeal and 383 days based on the second appeal) is not persuasive. A terminal disclaimer was filed on June 1, 2004 in the above identified application to Patent No. 6,025,474. While the application was allowed pursuant to an adverse determination of patentability by the BPAI, the application is subject to a terminal disclaimer due to the issuance of another patent claiming subject matter that is not patentably distinct. Under 37 CFR 1.701 (a)(3), the patent is not entitled to patent term extension because the patent is subject to a "terminal disclaimer due to the issuance of another patent claiming subject matter that is not patentably distinct" The statute § 154(b)(2) states that a "patent shall not be eligible for extension under this paragraph if it is subject to a terminal disclaimer due to the issue of another patent claiming subject matter that is not patentably distinct from that under appellate review" and the patent that issued is subject to a terminal disclaimer.


The Office has no authority to grant an extension of the term due to administrative delays except as authorized by 35 U.S.C. § 154.

The Office's electronic record (Patent Application and Location Monitoring system (PALM)) will be adjusted to show that zero (0) days of patent term extension has been accrued to the above-identified application.

After mailing of this decision, the above-identified application will be forwarded to Office of Publications for further processing.

Petitioner's deposit account has not been charged a petition fee.

Telephone inquiries with regard to this communication should be directed to Mark O. Polutta at (571) 272-7709.



Mark Polutta

Senior Legal Advisor
Office of Patent Legal Administration
Office of the Deputy Commissioner
for Patent Examination Policy